



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,770	02/05/2002	Bjorn Landfeldt	106448.00051	7579

27045 7590 05/24/2006

ERICSSON INC.  
6300 LEGACY DRIVE  
M/S EVR C11  
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 10/068,770	Applicant(s) LANDFELDT ET AL.	
	Examiner Thomas Duong	Art Unit 2145	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 01 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: None.  
Claim(s) objected to: None.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-22.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
Please see attachment sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
**JASON CARDONE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Argument*

1. The Applicants' arguments filed on May 1, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

2. With regard to claims 1 and 12, the Applicants point out that,

- *In contrast, Applicant's invention is characterized by an information transformer that manipulates information contained in the request. The request is still transmitted to the server that hosts the desired object; i.e., the request is not redirected.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because this is exactly what Cohen discloses, *"to transform the complete URL in each GET request transmitted by a client to an appropriate absolute URL.*

*Specifically, the IP address found in the destination field in the IP header of the packet(s) from the client containing the GET request are added as a prefix by the proxy redirector to the complete URL in the GET request. As a result, the complete URL in the GET request is modified to form an absolute URL"* (Cohen, col.5, lines 16-23). Hence, Cohen clearly teaches of a network entity (i.e., proxy redirector 104) responsible for modifying the data contained in the request as appropriate.

3. With regard to claims 1 and 12, the Applicants point out that,

Art Unit: 2145

- *In contrast, Applicant's invention is characterized by an information transformer that manipulates information contained in the request. The request is still transmitted to the server that hosts the desired object; i.e., the request is not redirected.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because this language is not present in the claimed invention at all.

4. With regard to claims 1 and 12, the Applicants point out that,

- *Thus, according to Applicants' invention, the redirection is performed on the requested datastream and not on the request. In other words, there is a difference between manipulating the address of the request (Cohen) and manipulating the content of the request indicating where to send a response to the request (Applicants' invention).*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because this is a clear contradiction to the claimed language of "an information transformer coupled to said input for transforming said first information in said service request into second information which directs the server to route the data stream to a proxy ..." (Claim 1).

5. With regard to claims 1 and 12, the Applicants point out that,

- *Thus, according to Applicants' invention, the redirection is performed on the requested datastream and not on the request. In other words, there is a difference between manipulating the address of the request (Cohen) and*

manipulating the content of the request indicating where to send a response to the request (Applicants' invention).

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because, according to the present claimed language, Cohen's transformation of the URL in the GET request, wherein *"the IP address found in the destination field in the IP header of the packet(s) from the client containing the GET request are added as a prefix by the proxy redirector to the complete URL in the GET request"* (Cohen, col.5, lines 18-21), is a clear manipulation of *"said first information in said service request into second information"* (Claim 1).

6. With regard to claims 15-17 and 19-22, the Applicants point out that,

- *Whereas claim 12 includes limitations analogous to those of claim 1, Cohen also fails to anticipate that claim. Whereas claims 4-6 and 8- 11 are dependent from claim 1 and claims 15-17 and 19-22 are dependent from claim 12, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, those claims are also not anticipated by Cohen.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because of the arguments presented above.

7. With regard to claims 2-3, 7, 13-14, and 18, the Applicants point out that,

- *Claims 1 and 12 have been shown, supra, to be patentable over Cohen. Gupta and Earl fail to cure the deficiencies of Cohen and, therefore, claims 1 and 12 are also patentable over Cohen in view of Gupta or Earl. Therefore, whereas claims 2-3 and 7 are dependent from claim 1 and claims 13-14 and 18 are dependent*

Art Unit: 2145

*from claim 12, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, those claims are also patentable over Cohen in view of Gupta or Earl.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because of the arguments presented above.